

## REMARKS

### 1. Claims Amendments.

Claim 1 has been amended to clean up some of the language and incorporate the subject matter of Claims 2-7 and 12-16 as follows:

- 1.a) now includes the subject matter of Claims 12-16 (the materials of manufacture of the bearing body, the running wheels, and the sliding bearing);
- 1.b) includes subject matter from Claim 2;
- 1.c) includes subject matter from Claim 3;
- 1.d) includes subject matter from Claim 4;
- 1.e) includes subject matter from Claim 5;
- 1.f) includes subject matter from Claim 6; and
- 1.i) includes subject matter from Claim 7.

Further, the subject matter of 1.g) is taken from page 7, lines 8-12 and line 28 through page 8, line 3 of the Specification, and the subject matter of 1.h) is taken from page 11, line 18 through page 12, line 2 of the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2-7 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 8 has been amended to depend from Claim 1 rather than cancelled Claim 5 and to clean up some of the language. No new matter has been added.

Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to clean up some of the language. No new matter has been added.

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from Claim 10 for better clarity rather than Claim 1 and to clean up some of the language. No new matter has been added.

Claims 12-16 have been cancelled without prejudice.

### 2. 35 USC 112 Rejections.

Applicant has amended the claims as necessary to address the examiner's concerns under 35 USC 112. No new matter has been added.

### 3. 35 USC 103 Rejections.

The claims have been rejected under various combinations of cited art under 35 USC 103. Claims 1, 5, and 8-16 have been rejected over Foltz '827. Claims 2-4 have been rejected over Foltz '827 in view of Whitley '618. Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected over Foltz '827 in view of Owens '671. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Foltz '827 nor any combination of Foltz '827 with Whitley '618 or Owens '671 teach or suggest each and every element of amended Claim 1, the only independent claim, and therefore Claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom are allowable.


To sustain a rejection under 35 USC § 103, the examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. Further, the *prima facie* case requires at least "some reason" that would have led a one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the prior art in a particular manner. *Takeda Chemical Indus. Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.*, 492 F.3d 1350, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

A comparison of the amended claims to the cited art now shows that none of the reference teaches or suggests each and every element of amended independent Claim 1 or remaining dependent Claims 8-11, and as such the present invention is not obvious over Foltz '827 or any combination of Foltz '827 with Whitley '618 or Owens '671. For these reasons, Applicant requests that the Examiner find the pending claims allowable.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for examination and allowance and respectfully request such actions. If the examiner has any questions that can be answered by telephone, please contact the patent attorney of record at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Laurence P. Colton  
USPTO Reg. No. 33,371

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP  
1230 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 3100  
Atlanta GA 30309

Tel: 404.815.3681  
Fax: 404.685.6981  
E-Mail: lcolton@sgrlaw.com